



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/991,755	11/19/2001	Travis J. Parry	10013227-1	5318

7590 01/27/2006

HEWLETT- PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

PATTERSON, RASHAN OMAR

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2622

DATE MAILED: 01/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/991,755

Applicant(s)

PARRY, TRAVIS J.

Examiner

Rashan O. Patterson

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 November 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 November 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11-19-01
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-3,10-11,15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brandkamp (US 5898821).

Regarding claim 1, Brandkamp discloses an image device (35-1) comprising a processor adapted to receive and recognize archive files from one or more sources and perform operations based on the archive file type, wherein each archive file comprises one or more print jobs (Col. 5 lines 13-19); a storage device coupled to the processor and adapted to store archive files and print jobs (Col. 5 lines 13-19, lines 54-55); and where in the processor is coupled to one of an integral translator or an external translator that is adapted to translate each print job of the archived files into a print-ready format (Col. 8 lines 44-50).

Art Unit: 2622

Regarding claim 2, Brandkamp discloses an imaging device (35-1) , wherein the one of more sources comprises one of a managing printer (35-1), computer (4a) and a processor (8a) (Col3 lines 57-61).

Regarding claim 3, Brandkamp discloses an imaging device (35-1) wherein the print-ready format is one of Printer Control Language, Postscript , and graphical language (Col. 4 lines 51-54).

Regarding claims 10 and 16 Brandkamp discloses a method of job retention for one or more imaging devices comprising: receiving an archive file containing one or more print jobs (Col. 5 lines 13-19); performing one or more operations based on the archive file received (Col. 5 lines 13-19); translating each print job of received archive file into a print ready- format (Col. 8 lines 44-50); performing one or more user defined operations (Col 5 lines 26-29).

Regarding claims 11 and 17 Brandkamp discloses the method wherein translating each print job of the received archive file into a print-ready format comprises translating each print job of the received archive file into one of Printer Control language, Post Script, and a graphical language (Col. 8 lines 44-50; Col. 4 lines 51-54).

Regarding claim 15, Brandkamp discloses the method comprising transferring the archive file to the one or more imaging devices (Col 5 lines 13-15; lines 54-55).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 4,9,13-14,19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandkamp (US 5898821) in view of Mastie et al (US 6145031).

Regarding claim 4, Brandkamp does not disclose an imaging device where in the storage device comprises one of more of an SRAM, DRAM, non-volatile memory, register, magnetic media, and optical media

Mastie et al. discloses an imaging device (12a) where in the storage device (10) comprises one of more of an SRAM, DRAM, non-volatile memory, register, magnetic media, and optical media (Col 4 lines 38-41).

Brandkamp and Mastie et al. are combinable because they both incorporate an image processing device.

It would have been obvious at the time of invention for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Brandkamp with Mastie et al.

The reason for doing so would have been to have an imaging device (12a) where in the storage device (10) comprises one of more of an SRAM, DRAM, non-volatile memory, register, magnetic media, and optical media as taught by Mastie et al. in Col 4 lines 38-41.

Therefor it would have been obvious to combine Brandkamp with Mastie et al. in order to obtain the invention disclosed in claim 4.

Regarding claim 9, Brandkamp does not disclose the imaging device further comprising an administrative program coupled to the processor and adapted to perform print job management.

Mastie et al. discloses the imaging device (12a) further comprising an administrative program coupled to the processor and adapted to perform print job management (Col 3 lines 57-63).

Brandkamp and Mastie et al. are combinable because they both incorporate an image processing device.

It would have been obvious at the time of invention for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Brandkamp with Mastie et al.

The reason for doing so would have been to have the imaging device (12a) further comprising an administrative program coupled to the processor and adapted to perform print job management as taught by Mastie et al. in Col 3 lines 57-63.

Therefor it would have been obvious to combine Brandkamp with Mastie et al. in order to obtain the invention disclosed in claim 9.

Regarding claims 13 and 19, Brandkamp does not disclose the method wherein performing one or more user identified operations comprises one or more of: transmitting one or more of the print jobs to user identified addresses; transferring one or more print jobs to an appropriate directory; storing one or more of the print jobs for subsequent processing; printing on or more of the print jobs.

Art Unit: 2622

Mastie et al. discloses the method wherein performing one or more user identified operations comprises one or more of: transmitting one or more of the print jobs to user identified addresses (Col 5 lines 6-14); transferring one or more print jobs to an appropriate directory (Col 6 lines 30-51); storing one or more of the print jobs for subsequent processing (Col 3 lines 57- 67); printing on or more of the print jobs (Col 3 lines 57- 67).

Brandkamp and Mastie et al. are combinable because they both incorporate an image processing device.

It would have been obvious at the time of invention for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Brandkamp with Mastie et al.

The reason for doing so would have been to have the method wherein performing one or more user identified operations comprises one or more of: transmitting one or more of the print jobs to user identified addresses as taught by Mastie et al. Col 5 lines 6-14; transferring one or more print jobs to an appropriate directory as taught by Mastie et al. Col 6 lines 30-51; storing one or more of the print jobs for subsequent processing as taught by Mastie et al. Col 3 lines 57- 67; printing on or more of the print jobs as taught by Mastie et al. Col 3 lines 57- 67.

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Brandkamp with Mastie et al. in order to obtain the invention disclosed in claims 13 and 19.

Regarding claim 14, Brandkamp does not disclose the method wherein transferring one or more of the print jobs to an appropriate directory comprises transferring one or more of the print jobs to an appropriate directory based on one of a

Art Unit: 2622

file name associated with the print job, a file type associated with the print job, an address associated with the print job, a personal identification number associated with the print job, an identifier associated with the print job.

Mastie et al. discloses the method wherein transferring one or more of the print jobs to an appropriate directory comprises transferring one or more of the print jobs to an appropriate directory based on one of a file name associated with the print job, a file type associated with the print job, an address associated with the print job, a personal identification number associated with the print job, an identifier associated with the print job (Col 5 lines 6-14).

Brandkamp and Mastie et al. are combinable because they both incorporate an image processing device.

It would have been obvious at the time of invention for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Brandkamp with Mastie et al.

The reason for doing so would have been to have the method wherein transferring one or more of the print jobs to an appropriate directory comprises transferring one or more of the print jobs to an appropriate directory based on one of a file name associated with the print job, a file type associated with the print job, an address associated with the print job, a personal identification number associated with the print job, an identifier associated with the print job as taught by Mastie et al. Col 5 lines 6-14.

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Brandkamp with Mastie et al. in order to obtain the invention disclosed in claim 14.

Art Unit: 2622

Regarding claim 20, Brandkamp does not disclose the computer usable medium wherein transferring one or more of the print jobs to an appropriate directory comprises transferring one or more of the print jobs to an appropriate directory on one of a file name associated with the print job, a file type associated with the print job, an address associated with the print job, a personal identification number associated with the print job, and an identifier associated with the print job.

Mastie et al. discloses the computer usable medium wherein transferring one or more of the print jobs to an appropriate directory comprises transferring one or more of the print jobs to an appropriate directory on one of a file name associated with the print job, a file type associated with the print job, an address associated with the print job, a personal identification number associated with the print job, and an identifier associated with the print job (Col 5 lines 6-14).

Brandkamp and Mastie et al. are combinable because they both incorporate an image processing device.

It would have been obvious at the time of invention for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Brandkamp with Mastie et al.

The reason for doing so would have been to have the computer usable medium wherein transferring one or more of the print jobs to an appropriate directory comprises transferring one or more of the print jobs to an appropriate directory on one of a file name associated with the print job, a file type associated with the print job, an address associated with the print job, a personal identification number associated with the print

Art Unit: 2622

job, and an identifier associated with the print job as taught by Mastie et al. Col 5 lines 6-14.

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Brandkamp with Mastie et al. in order to obtain the invention disclosed in claim 20.

6. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandkamp (US 5898821) in view of Venkatraman et al. (US 5956487).

Regarding claim 7 Brandkamp does not disclose the image device comprising an embedded web server coupled to the processor, wherein the embedded web server is adapted to interface between the processor and one or more user identified addresses.

Venkatraman et al. discloses the imaging device (10) comprising an embedded web server (14) coupled to the processor(200), wherein the embedded web server is adapted to interface between the processor and one or more user-identified addresses (Col 3 lines 5-7; Col 4 lines 17-27).

Brandkamp and Venkatraman et al. are combinable because they both incorporate using an imaging device.

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention for one skilled in the art to modify Brandkamp with Venkatraman et al.

The motivation for doing so would have been to have the image device comprising an embedded web server coupled to the processor, wherein the embedded web server is adapted to interface between the processor and one or more user identified addresses as shown in Col 3 lines 5-7 and Col 4 lines 17-27.

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Brandkamp with Venkatraman et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 7.

7. Claims 5, 12, and 18, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandkamp (US 5898821) in view of Mastie et al. (US 6145031) further in view of Collard et al. (US 5825988).

Regarding claim 5 Brandkamp does not disclose the imaging device wherein the operations which the processor is adapted to perform based on the archive file type include one or more of: decompressing the print jobs of the archive files; storing the print jobs of the archive files into appropriate directories; and transmitting the print jobs of the archive files to user-identified addresses.

Mastie discloses the imaging device wherein the operations which the processor is adapted to perform based on the archive file type include one or more of storing the print jobs or the archive files in to appropriate directories (Col 3 lines 57-63; Col 4 lines 39-43); transmitting files to user identified addresses (Col 5 lines 6-14).

Collard et al. discloses the imaging device wherein the operations which the professor is adapted to perform based on the archive file type include one or more of: Decompressing the print jobs of the archive flies (Col. 5 lines 32-40).

Brandkamp, Mastie et al. and Collard et al. are combinable because they all incorporate using an imaging device.

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention for one of ordinary skill in

Art Unit: 2622

the art to modify Brandkamp with Mastie et al. and Collard et al.

The motivation for doing so would have been to have imaging device wherein the imaging device wherein the operations which the processor is adapted to perform based on the archive file type include one or more of storing the print jobs or the archive files in to appropriate directories as taught by Mastie in Col 3 lines 57-63; Col 4 lines 39-43; transmitting files to user identified addresses as taught by Mastie in Col 5 lines 6-14 and the operations which the processor is adapted to perform based on the archive file type include one or more of: Decompressing the print jobs of the archive files as in Col. 5 lines 32-40.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Brandkamp with Mastie et al. and Collard et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 5.

Regarding claims 12 and 18 Brandkamp does not disclose the method where in performing one or more operations bases on the archive file type receives comprises one or more of: decompressing each file of the received archive file as separate print jobs; storing one or more of the files of the received archive file as separate print jobs; transmitting one or more files of the received archive file to user-identified addresses as separate print jobs

Mastie et al. discloses the method where in performing one or more operations bases on the archive file type receives comprises one or more of: storing one or more of the files of the received archive file as separate print jobs (Col 3 lines 57-63); transmitting one or more files of the received archive file to user-identified addresses as separate print jobs (Col 5 lines 6-14).

Collard et al. discloses the method wherein performing one or more operations based on the archive file type received comprises one or more of: decompressing each file of the received archive file as separate print jobs (Col. 5 lines 32-40).

Brandkamp, Mastie et al. and Collard et al. are combinable because they both incorporate using an imaging device.

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to modify Brandkamp with Mastie et al. and Collard et al.

The motivation for doing so would have been to have the method wherein performing one or more operations based on the archive file type received comprises one or more of: decompressing each file of the received archive file as separate print jobs as taught by Collard in Col. 5 lines 32-40; storing one or more of the files of the received archive file as separate print jobs as taught by Mastie in Col 3 lines 57-63; transmitting one or more files of the received archive file to user-identified addresses as separate print jobs as taught by Mastie in Col 5 lines 6-14.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Brandkamp with Mastie et al. and Collard et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claims 12 and 18.

8. Claims 6, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandkamp (US 5898821) further in view of Collard et al. (US 5825988).

Regarding claim 6, Brandkamp et al. does not disclose the imaging device comprising a control panel couples to the processor, where in the control panel is

Art Unit: 2622

adapted to enable access and manipulation of the archive files and the associated print jobs.

Collard et al discloses the imaging device comprising a control panel couples to the processor, where in the control panel is adapted to enable access and manipulation of the archive files and the associated print jobs (Col 7 lines 6-18, lines 40-44).

Brandkamp and Collard et al. are combinable because they both incorporate using an imaging device.

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Brandkamp with Collard et al.

The motivation for doing so would have been to have the imaging device comprising a control panel couples to the processor, where in the control panel is adapted to enable access and manipulation of the archive files and the associated print jobs as shown in Col 7 lines 6-18, lines 40-44.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Brandkamp with Collard et al. to obtain the invention specified in claim 6.

Regarding claim 8 Brandkamp does not disclose the image device wherein the storage device is adapted to store archive files and print jobs based on one or more of the archive file type, archive file name and an identifier associated with the archive file.

Collard et al. discloses the image device wherein the storage device is adapted to store archive files and print jobs based on one or more of the archive file type, archive file name and an identifier associated with the archive file (Col 7 lines 45-51).

Art Unit: 2622

Brandkamp and Collard et al. are combinable because they both incorporate using an imaging device.

It would have been obvious at the time of invention to modify Brandkamp with Collard et al.

The motivation for doing so would have been to have an image device wherein the storage device is adapted to store archive files and print jobs based on one or more of the archive file type, archive file name and an identifier associated with the archive file as shown in Col 7 lines 45-51.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Brandkamp with Collard et al. to obtain the invention specified in claim 8.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rashan O. Patterson whose telephone number is 571-272-0597. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ed Coles can be reached on 571-272-7402. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2622

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ROP

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'A' followed by a horizontal line.A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Twyler Lamb'.

TWYLER LAMB
PRIMARY EXAMINER